DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 298 645 EA 020 319

AUTHOR Goodlad, John I.
TITLE Linking Schools and Universities. Symbiotic Partnerships. Occasional Paper No. 1.
INSTITUTION Washington Univ., Seattle. Center for Educational Renewal.
PUB DATE 87
NOTE 49p.
AVAILABLE FROM Publications, Center for Educational Renewal, College of Education, University of Washington, Seattle, WA 98195 ($3.50 prepaid).
PUB TYPE Viewpoints (120)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College School Cooperation; Cooperative Planning; *Cooperative Programs; Coordination; *Educational Cooperation; Educational Innovation; Elementary Secondary Education; Higher Education; *Institutional Cooperation; Networks; Universities
IDENTIFIERS *National Network for Educational Renewal

ABSTRACT

This paper discusses an approach to educational improvement through collaboration between schools and universities. It develops the concept of symbiosis between unlike institutions in which each recognizes need for the other in seeking to fulfill its self-interest. The first section defines the essential characteristics of successful renewal: that workers at all levels must have optimal opportunities to combine their expertise, and that there must be a continuous infusion of both relevant knowledge and alternative ideas for practice stemming from inquiry into the enterprise. Accordingly, the first section reviews past symbiotic efforts at educational reform that have collectively contributed insights to a partnership strategy. Based on these insights, the essentials of school-university partnerships are defined: (1) complementary dissimilarity among the partners; (2) overlapping self-interests and the recognition of such by all partners; and (3) commitment among all partners to the belief that the potential gains in satisfying self-interest are worth the efforts and inevitable sacrifices of close collaboration. The last part of the paper describes the principles, mission, goals, and structure of the National Network for Educational Renewal, which consists of 14 partnerships in different states. (TE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

John Goodlad

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ED298645

Center for Educational Renewal

LINKING SCHOOLS AND UNIVERSITIES

SYMBIOTIC PARTNERSHIPS

JOHN I. GOODLAD

Occasional Paper No. 1

December 1986

Revised 1987

OCCASIONAL PAPER SERIES

Institute for the Study of Educational Policy
College of Education
University of Washington
Seattle, Washington 98195

EA 020 319

LINKING SCHOOLS AND UNIVERSITIES

SYMBIOTIC PARTNERSHIPS

JOHN I. GOODLAD

Occasional Paper No. 1

December 1986

Revised 1987

THE CENTER FOR EDUCATIONAL RENEWAL

The Center for Educational Renewal was created in September 1985, as a unit of the Institute for the Study of Educational Policy, College of Education, University of Washington. Its first phase of work, 1985-1990, focuses on three closely related sets of activities:

1. A comprehensive examination of representative schools, colleges, and departments of education in order to determine current conditions and circumstances regarding the education of educators;

2. A consideration of selected professions for purposes of learning about problems and issues of preparing professionals in other fields and about practices offering suggestions and even models for educating educators for the schools;

3. The establishment of school-university partnerships for purposes of simultaneously improving schooling and the education of educators.

To date, the Center's activities have been supported by grants from the Danforth, Exxon Education, Ford, Hewlett, MacArthur, and Mertz-Gilmore Foundations. Grants from other sources are pending. A project on problems and issues regarding access to knowledge is funded by the College Entrance Examination Board and will be brought to conclusion in 1987. The University of Washington is a congenial environment for the Center's work, providing physical resources and some support services.

The Center advances the third set of activities listed above through the National Network for Educational Renewal. Currently, this network comprises 14 school-university partnerships in as many states. These partnerships embrace 115 school districts and 17 colleges and universities (see Appendix) joined for purposes of simultaneously improving schooling and the education of educators. Copies of the Network newsletter, NNER NEWS, published several times a year, are available free of charge from the Center, until the supply is exhausted. Additional information on the Center's work is available free of charge to settings seriously considering the creation of school-university partnerships.

The Center for Educational Renewal produces, from time to time, reports on work in progress. Four Occasional Papers on the Center's major thrusts are listed on the back of the title page of this paper. This paper is devoted to a brief history of how the concept of school-university partnerships emerged in the mind of the author through earlier work, describes the National Network for Educational Renewal, and concludes with some of the rudimentary requirements of school-university partnerships belonging to the NNER.

John I. Goodlad
Professor and Director

LINKING SCHOOLS AND UNIVERSITIES
SYMBIOTIC PARTNERSHIPS

Introduction

The writer wrote what follows for purposes of informing the reader on an approach to effecting educational improvement through purposively linking schools and universities in a marriage of two quite different kinds of institutions. At this time, interest nationwide in such collaboration is growing, with the initiative coming from both school districts and colleges or universities.

Part of what follows focuses on a concept: a symbiotic relationship between unlike institutions in which each recognizes need for the other in seeking to fulfill its self-interests. In effect, the cultures merge in creating a new cultural entity made up of part of each while pursuing their own identities. Each also retains its autonomy except that authority and responsibility are shared in the overlapping areas of self-interest agreed to as being of mutual concern and constituting the agenda to be worked on collaboratively. The relationship and the accompanying ageements are not unlike those entered into by six families who agree to purchase forty acres of land. Each family is to hold title to five acres for its own home and exclusive use. The remaining ten acres are to be held in common, with facilities such as a swimming pool, tennis court, and horse trails to be owned and managed jointly and collaboratively. Like such property arrangements, school-university partnerships are to be long-term in nature, perhaps permanent.

Richard W. Clark (1986), in Occasional Paper No. 2, reviews past efforts to establish collaborations among schools and universities. He differentiates nicely between the concepts of partnership and network and their uses. His analysis attests to the usefulness of networks for exchanging information, sharing techniques, and even advancing individual competence. Partnerships of the kind envisioned in this paper, he observes, have potential for effecting fundamental change in the programs and activities of both schools and universities. But his historical account reveals the record of such linkages and outcomes to be thin--in fact, to be close to non-existent. Clark's diagnosis leads him to conclude that the necessary institutional commitments have been missing. Much the same can be said for the individual commitments in most failed marriages.

A major part of what follows recounts four decades of personal experience with strategies designed to improve educational settings. This summary necessitated my drawing on books and articles written by the author to describe or analyze these ventures; for this egocentricity I apologize. But this was the clearest and simplest way for me to lay the necessary groundwork for the conception of school-university partnerships as a strategy for educational improvement.

The conception has now been translated into a functioning reality: 14 school-university partnerships constituting the National Network for Educational Renewal. A sharply abbreviated summary of the "mission statement" of the NNER is included in this Occasional Paper.

The reader should understand that not one partnership in the group currently is close in its shared values, commitment, and accomplishments to what one might hope, ideally, would emerge from the envisioned collaboration. The range, from just getting organized to accomplishments worth putting up on the scoreboard, is substantial. At the upper end are instances of partnerships with new preparation programs for practitioners, schools well along in renewal, principals' centers or academies supported by both school districts and universities, explorations into appropriate uses of technology, and more. Schools and university programs evolved slowly to where they are today, warts and all. The partnerships and the National Network embracing them must be regarded as a long-term social experiment in reconstruction, with the necessary ingredients and combinations of ingredients largely unknown.

This Occasional Paper resulted from a request to me by Lee Greene, editor of The Principal, the journal of the National Association of Elementary School Principals, that I write a paper on school-university partnerships and the NNER. Instead, I provided him with several papers which I had written shortly before his request reached me: the mission statement of the NNER, a chapter of a book on school-university relations edited by Bernard R. Gifford, and Chapter I of a book on school-university partnerships edited by Kenneth A. Sirotnik and me (School/University Partnerships in Action), both books to be published by Teachers College Press in 1987 or 1988. Lee Greene chose from this material what he thought would be of most interest to the readers of The Principal. What he selected became the first several sections of this paper.

On behalf of the Center for Educational Renewal, I express appreciation to the National Association of Elementary School Principals and Teachers College Press for permission to construct the Center's Occasional Paper No. 1 largely from what they will soon publish. My colleagues join me in thanking Lee Greene for his superb editing of part of what follows.

Simultaneous Institutional and Individual Renewal

This paper is being written during still another cycle of attention to educational reform. What is frustrating and even dismaying about these cycles is that they regularly address virtually the same issues and pose such similar recommendations for reform.

Perhaps the most puzzling aspect of these reform cycles is the disjuncture between the target of the rhetoric of criticism and the targets singled out for improvement. Almost invariably, it is the institution or program--schooling, schools, teacher education, schools of education, general education--that requires attention. But it is the teacher or, ironically, the student who is to be reformed. We are led to believe that all will be well if we select brighter teachers, put them through tougher programs, and test them during their careers. Similarly, we are to give students tougher tests more often, or raise the expectations for passing grades, or both.

There is something pathological about all of this. It is akin to believing that we can eliminate juvenile delinquency by incarcerating and

rehabilitating delinquents. Certainly we must seek to rehabilitate juvenile delinquents but sociological theory has been directing our attention for decades to the malfunctioning community ecology that fosters delinquency. Failing to respond to the implications of such theory and focusing only on the unfortunate individuals parallels attacking the mosquito problem without going to the ponds and ditches where mosquitoes breed. Failing to look deeply into the institutions where our young are taught and their teachers teach and are prepared to teach is a similar folly, but one of much greater significance.

I am among those who hold to the proposition that recurring, strident attacks on schooling, teacher education, and undergraduate curricula and teaching, in the form of commission and task force reports, are symptomatic of inadequate renewing behavior in large numbers of schools and universities. We believe, further, that reform proposals directed only to the rehabilitation or replacement of individuals in these settings, however accurate the diagnosis of incompetence or inadequate effort, are doomed to failure and will serve only to assure, later, still another round of similar reform proposals.

We propose an alternative paradigm embracing simultaneous individual and institutional renewal. We believe such renewal to be feasible with or without an infusion of new people--which means, of course, belief in the capability for and potentiality of renewal among those persons now perceived not to be salvageable. It may be necessary to develop mechanisms for helping people move so as to achieve a better fit between individuals

and institutional settings. And the process of renewal probably would progress more quickly and smoothly if those educators now perceived to be beyond redemption were summarily removed from the scene. But agreeing on who these people are would be extraordinarily difficult, and then removing those about whom we agree is a task most of us would prefer to delegate.

Let us assume, then, that we must proceed with the educators--teachers and administrators--we have. Let us quit wringing our hands over an aging cohort and rejoice in the realization that so much seasoned experience is available to us. Let us extend best wishes and encouragement to the Holmes Group (1986) and the Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy (1986) and hope that their work ultimately will produce the most promising and best educated recruits for teaching in our schools. And let us refrain from the easy, melancholy disclaimer, "We've tried it before and it doesn't work"--because, more often than not, we have not and, because we have not, we do not know.

As this is being written, top officials from the President of the United States on down are pointing with pride to how quickly the "rising tide of mediocrity in our schools" has been replaced by a rising tide of reform. But the truth is that the steam already has gone out of the top-down school reform effort, the support money has not been forthcoming, and the so-called improvements have been largely around the edges.

There are those among us who believe, however, that the Great American Experiment with public, comprehensive, universal schooling is not over;

indeed, it may be just beginning (Goodlad, 1985). What we need is a reaffirmation and, probably, a redefinition of the role of education in a democracy, with particular attention to what is required for successful enculturation of the young; a much clearer delineation of the desired function of schools in this process; a clear articulation of the goals, substance, length, and breadth of the schooling deemed necessary; and a fresh commitment to both excellence and equity and how these can be forwarded simultaneously.

We are a highly pragmatic culture. We have a passion for what works. A change strategy focused on issues that are significant and, at the same time, practical in their apparent implications has considerable potential for gaining serious attention.

School-University Collaboration: A Non-Event?

Two essentials of renewal have been identified. First, the workers--at all levels--must have optimal opportunity to infuse their efforts with the expertise of others engaged in similar work. This notion has long inspired quiltmakers, boatbuilders, glassblowers, and other craftspersons to come together for purposes of sharing designs and techniques. Second, there must be continuous infusion of both relevant knowledge and alternative (indeed, countervailing) ideas for practice stemming from inquiry into the enterprise.

For a host of reasons, the schooling enterprise is at best only weakly characterized by these essentials of renewal. The egg crate structure of

schools effectively isolates teachers from one another (Lortie, 1975). Administrators and supervisors, not teachers, show up most regularly at conferences. Local opportunities for inservice education tend to be district-inspired and conducted and, ironically, take teachers away from the institutional settings so in need of renewal (Tye, 1981). Serious proposals for teachers to have time for planning within their own buildings have surfaced only in recent years. The rhetoric regarding the schools as the most significant unit for change is not new (Goodlad, 1955), but the gap between rhetoric and reality remains formidable. The record of relating research and practice in medicine, public health, dentistry, and other professions is not without its warts and blemishes. Yet, close alliances between schools of agriculture in universities and the practice of agriculture have produced hardier wheat, eliminated many plant diseases, and enormously increased productivity. Leading businesses and industries devote a share of their income to research and development; employees attend university-sponsored institutes and workshops, with costs borne routinely by their companies.

Circumstances in the schooling workplace are quite different. The budget for research and development, if it exists at all, is rarely more than a fraction of one percent of the total. A few days of inservice education for teachers are scattered over the year and usually are taught by district staff, with an occasional speaker or consultant from a university. Attendance at a university is with one's own time and money. Rarely is there a long-term contract between a university and a school district for the renewal of employees and institutions.

Conversation among teachers and administrators rarely lauds their university preparation programs or the role of universities in enhancing practice. Yet, ironically, the knowledge base about both teaching and leadership is to a large degree the same, whether used to prepare personnel for schools or for a wide range of business enterprises (Peters and Waterman, 1982). In the major universities, education professors eschew both the preparation of teachers (Judge, 1982) and sustained involvement with schools, their prime source of reward being publication in refereed journals. But school teachers and administrators rarely read these journals and, indeed, inhabit a culture that values action over reading, reflection, and dialogue about alternatives.

The history of school-university collaboration is not so much replete with failure as it is short on examples of carefully crafted agreements and programs accompanied by the ingredient considered by Clark (1986) to be essential for success--namely, individual and institutional commitment on both sides. In short, the joining of schools (and school districts) and universities in commonly purposive and mutually beneficial linkages is a virtually untried and, therefore, unstudied phenomenon.

Evolution of an Educational Improvement Strategy

Symbiosis is a provocative concept. Viewed positively, it refers to unlike organisms (or institutions) joined intimately in mutually beneficial relationships. For there to be a symbiotic partnership, presumably three

minimum conditions must prevail: dissimilarity between or among the partners; mutual satisfaction of self-interests; and sufficient selflessness on the part of each member to assure the satisfaction of self-interests on the part of all members. Regarding partnerships between schools and universities, the first condition is clearly present. The others must be created and require resolve, commitment, planning, creativity, leadership, sacrifice, and endurance.

Since 1947, I have been involved in school-university collaborative efforts of one kind or another, efforts to improve teacher education or schools or both simultaneously, and research on some aspect of one or more of these. Several of the lessons learned are highly relevant to understanding how our present educational improvement strategy--namely, school-university partnerships--has evolved.

The Atlanta Area Teacher Education Service

The Atlanta Area Teacher Education Service (AATES), created at the close of World War II, joined six rapidly growing school districts and six colleges and universities in a collaborative effort to upgrade the qualifications of practicing teachers, many of whom did not possess baccalaureate degrees and formal preparation to teach (Goodlad and Jordan, 1950). It served this purpose well. Teachers registered for degrees at the institution of their choice and poured into conveniently located classrooms to be taught by the best qualified professors, regardless of institutional

affiliation. Individuals, not institutions, were the focus and locus. Perhaps in large part because of the magnitude of the enterprise, some institutional changes occurred by serendipity.

One was a renaissance in the arts in schools which had its genesis in the fact that the esteemed artist and chairman of the art department at the University of Georgia, Lamar Dodd, became motivated about the possibilities while teaching AATES courses. He introduced into the art department a vision of cultivating the abilities of large numbers of teachers to develop the artistic talents of their children.

Another sub-program was a rather accurate version of the sequence in child study meticulously designed by Daniel Prescott, first at the University of Chicago and later at the University of Maryland. Its structure differed markedly from that of the courses offered routinely and, usually, on an ad hoc basis through the AATES. First, there was a three-year sequence, beginning with the detailed study of a single child and proceeding through the study of a child and children in a larger social context. Second, each adult cohort was brought together initially and subsequently in two-week summer workshops, serving to anchor the year-long study and class sessions at both ends. Third, and perhaps most important, a principal and a group of teachers from a single school formed a sub-cohort as a condition of participation.

I joined Lynn Shufelt, director of the AATES child study program, in an experimental fourth year for school-based clusters that had completed the

standard three-year sequence. Our purpose was to address the question of what child development, as we had come to understand it, meant for school and classroom practice. Again and again during that year and the next, working with fourth-year cohorts, dialogue turned to frustration over school-based regularities some perceived to be at cross-purposes with the principals' and teachers' insights into the developmental processes of children.

By 1954 or thereabouts--some eight years after the founding of the AATES--the schools in the Atlanta area beginning to stand out for their exemplary (and often innovative) practices were staffed by a principal and core of teachers who had come through the complete child study sequence.

There are several learnings here:

First, for a school to become renewing, there must be at least a core of teachers and the principal engaged continuously in inquiry about the nature, quality, and relevance of the educational enterprise in which they are engaged; second, there must be time away from daily demands, as in summer workshops (with no children to teach), for periods of sustained dialogue and reflection; and third, it is highly desirable and perhaps even necessary for there to be some interpenetration with other cohort groups, alternative drummers, and countervailing ideas on provocative questions.

The Englewood Project

For the last two or three years of the period just described and for a half-dozen years later, I directed the Englewood Project. With funds provided by the William Vanderbilt family and full approval of the superintendent and board of the Sarasota, Florida, school district, I worked with the principal (more than one over the years) in designing a new elementary school program and a new building unit to accommodate it.

Growth in enrollment demanded a change in the one-grade-per-class-per-teacher structure which the old six-room building and graded structure of the Englewood Elementary School had accommodated so comfortably. Instead of having one teacher teach the overload of 30 or so students in a multi-graded class, all teachers transitted to a multi-grade, then a multi-age, and ultimately a nongraded class (Goodlad, 1958). There has emerged no evidence to challenge the claim that this was the first nongraded, team-taught elementary school in the United States (Goodlad and Anderson, 1959). It was an early experiment, too, with a peer review system of teacher evaluation (Bahner, 1960).

Two significant learnings emerged for me from the experience: First, just as the culture of the individual school can powerfully resist changes imposed upon it, that same culture can be a potent force for change, given proper conditions (Goodlad, 1977); second, one of these conditions is a supportive infrastructure that not only encourages the principal and teachers to design the best possible settings for learning and teaching but also provides the necessary resources and supporting mechanisms.

The League of Cooperating Schools

The League of Cooperating Schools in Southern California was deliberately designed (in 1966) to provide this infrastructure. I have described elsewhere several of the key elements: the individual school as the center of change; a network (18 schools in 18 districts); a long-term commitment signed and approved by each district's superintendent and board; a rather substantial supporting "hub" independent of the districts and loosely connected to a major university; and a data-gathering process capable of providing useful information for formative evaluation at both the school and network level (Goodlad, 1975).

This hub provided staff members who maintained direct linkages to the schools, conducted monthly meetings of principals focused on their problems of leadership, published a newsletter, provided research summaries in areas of interest and demand, organized all-League conferences, served as a switching-station for exchanging information and bringing together small groups of teachers with like interests, occasionally brought in speakers and consultants, provided information to superintendents, arranged periodic meetings for them, and gathered various kinds of data.

The prime focus of attention throughout the six years of the League's formal existence was the school as the center of change and the cultivation within it of individual and institutional renewal. To the degree possible, each school was to be a self-renewing entity through development and refinement of an inquiry process commonly referred to as DDAE--for dia-

logue, decisions, actions, and evaluation (Bentzen, 1974). The monthly meetings of principals frequently addressed their role in fostering such a process. Hub staff members assisted each school faculty with problem solving, sometimes infusing into the dialogue data on the status of DDAE in that particular school.

The hub served as a major part of the Research Division of the Institute for Development of Educational Activities (/I/D/E/A/), then an arm of the Kettering Foundation. This organization built into its Individually Guided Education (I.G.E.) program key elements of the strategy developed in the League of Cooperating Schools. I.G.E., in turn, became a nationwide school improvement strategy.[1]

Those of us who were most intimately involved with the Study of Educational Change and School Improvement, the research activity accompanying the League, became convinced that DDAE was the most important and, at the same time, the most underrated and least understood part of the strategy that the /I/D/E/A/ staff sought to adapt and incorporate into I.G.E. This, we believe, was the most neglected ingredient in the I.G.E. schools at that time, cut off as most of them were from research-oriented institutions such as universities.

A second shortcoming in the I.G.E. adaptation was the looseness and disparateness of the national network. /I/D/E/A/ should have served as the central hub for the hubs of a dozen or a hundred Leagues of Schools,

---

[1]Today /I/D/E/A/ offers school settings a still more refined process for beginning and advancing renewal, involving the principal, a district representative, teachers, students, parents, and community members.

each with its own identity and infrastructure. Instead, given its limited resources, /I/D/E/A/ sought to monitor a widely dispersed collection of schools, depending heavily on films and written materials to convey concepts and processes. There was little opportunity to build, school-by-school, the level of trust and candor that characterized the meetings of the principals of League schools. Of course, there were some notable exceptions to this generalization.

Mostly, experience with the League of Cooperating Schools and the Study of Educational Change confirmed the learnings gleaned from the AATES and the Englewood Project built into the strategy from the beginning. But it strengthened several immeasurably and added several more. Chief among these are the following:

First, although certain of the concepts are more seminal and important than others--for example, developing the renewing capacity of those closest to students, the individual school as the center of change, and the process of inquiry--potency for change lies in combining all of these and more within a supportive infrastructure which includes ample access to alternatives and relevant knowledge; second, the most significant elements, such as collaborative inquiry, are also the most difficult to achieve and, simultaneously, the most deceptively subtle in their mature functioning; third, in efforts to achieve the positive potential of symbiotic partnerships between schools (or school districts) and universities, the latter are least likely to perceive the relationship as relevant to their self-interests and, therefore, least likely to enter seriously into the marriage and to make it work.

A Study of Schooling

The fourth and last contributor to the partnership strategy that evolved was an intensive study of 38 schools (Goodlad, 1984). The study strengthened a number of postulates about the conditions and circumstances of schooling: for example, relatively impotent, haphazard, short-term staff development activities focused on individuals and removed from school sites; little time or stimulus for site-based renewal; little evidence of attention to, and encouragement of, long-term planning at either the school or district level.

The study revealed, also, the prevalence and persistence of instructional, curricular, and organizational regularities running counter to a rather large body of literature that has, for some time, pointed to the need for alternatives. The fact that these regularities have fared so well in the face of contrary authorized opinions (Buchman, 1987) and cyclical attacks attests to both their virility and their usefulness to some educators and school patrons alike. Practices that serve well the special interests or beliefs of those most closely attached to them are not easily changed.

The thesis emerging in my mind, then, as the findings from A Study of Schooling began to fall into place, comprised several inter-related themes:

First, juxtaposition of the action-oriented culture of the school and the inquiry-oriented culture of the university offers promise of shaking loose the calcified programs of both (e.g., how teachers teach and how

teachers are prepared to teach); second, a school-university partnership offers promise of stimulating collaborative inquiry into both the problems of the schools and the relevance of various research paradigms; third, the agendas of instructional, curricular, and organizational improvements needed in the schools and of the relevance of teacher education and research programs in schools of education appear to overlap and thus to satisfy the criterion of mutual self-interests characteristic of a potentially powerful partnership.

School-University Partnerships

These themes come together in a mental design for educational improvement which I have chosen to characterize as a symbiotic partnership. To be productive, as stated earlier, such a partnership must include the following minimum essentials: (1) complementary dissimilarity between or among the partners--that is, an element lacked by one is present in another; (2) overlapping self-interests and the recognition of such by all partners; (3) commitment among all partners to the belief that the potential gains in satisfying self-interests are worth the efforts and inevitable sacrifices of close collaboration.

There is some cynicism in this last essential. Nonetheless, it is fair to say that marriages end or become marriages in name only when the self-interests of one partner are no longer satisfied by the other.

Partnerships unlikely to be satisfying and lasting are characterized by too great or too little dissimilarity, low degree and low recognition of

overlapping self-interests, and unwillingness to change behavior or give up ground or turf in recognition of the other partner's self-interests and need to satisfy them. A successful union requires sufficient selflessness for there to be continuing, mutually satisfying benefits.

Clearly, schools and universities differ markedly. Whether or not the dissimilarities are potentially complementary in educational improvement depends on one's perspective on what needs doing. Data from A Study of Schooling revealed chronic problems of schooling. Still other studies and analyses suggest very loose ties between the production of knowledge in universities and the decision-making processes in schools. Further, it appears that the long-standing regularities of schooling, much more than the teacher education programs of colleges and universities, direct what teachers and principals do each day. One is forced to conclude that teaching is a weak profession. Both schools and universities have a stake in changing this situation, for their mutual benefit and the welfare of society.

In summary, then, the argument for school-university partnerships might proceed somewhat as follows. For schools to get better, they must have better teachers, among other things. To prepare better teachers (and counselors, special educators, and administrators) universities must have access to school settings exhibiting the very best practices. To assure the best practices, schools must have ongoing access to alternative ideas and knowledge. For universities to have access to exemplary settings and for these settings to become and remain exemplary, the schools and the

preparing institutions must develop symbiotic relationships through joining together as equal partners. In the kind of partnership envisioned, universities have a stake in and responsibility for school improvement just as the schools have an interest in and responsibility for the education of those who will staff the schools.

For the past several years, my colleagues and I have been heavily involved in the development of such partnerships. In the process, we have become increasingly convinced of their merit and necessity and, simultaneously, equally impressed (and, at times depressed) with the difficulty of creating them.

Two of the three essential characteristics of successful partnerships are clearly present. First, the marriage partners are dissimilar--perhaps, given the nature of some universities, too dissimilar. Second, there are overlapping self-interests, some of which already have been identified. Unless the satisfaction of self-interests is present from the beginning--on both or all sides--the partnership will not flourish.

The potential for the third characteristic is blurred. For some universities, the initial commitment to educating personnel for the schools may be insufficient to generate a spirit of selflessness and a willingness to give up or share turf. For some schools and school districts, the gains seen to be associated with a close school-university relationship may be perceived as not worth the time and effort involved.

Let me elaborate on this critical third characteristic of successful partnerships. One of my continuing associations has been with a state

where a serious effort has been made to strengthen several networks of schools by aligning them with colleges and universities to form partnerships of the kind depicted here. The idea of closer university involvement brought forth sharp questioning and some open hostility from a group of school administrators from various parts of the state. The hostility was addressed particularly to departments and schools of education. "Why involve the schools of education?" they asked. "The professors don't listen to our problems. They just want to lecture to us and then go back to the ivy-covered tower."

I can add to this experience dozens of conversations with teachers and administrators who expressed little or no hope in getting help from a nearby university. Superintendents have described to me their own district-wide staff development programs operated entirely apart from universities or with selected speakers and consultants from higher education. Many see more rather than less of this sort of thing in the future. Educators in the schools have engaged in sharp criticism of teacher education programs while advancing the view that their own greater involvement in teacher preparation would be an improvement. Even when those with whom I talked acknowledged the potential contribution of universities to school improvement, there was far more pessimism than optimism about both the willingness of professors to become seriously involved and their ability to be of assistance. There is little on the university side to warrant optimism regarding willingness to go much beyond the noblesse oblige view of assistance to schools that has prevailed to some degree in the past. Most

professors rightly view direct, personal involvement in the myriad problems of schooling as endless. Many rightly feel ill-equipped. Just as schools of engineering, for example, have fewer and fewer professors who have engineered anything, schools of education--especially those in research-oriented universities--have fewer and fewer professors who have taught children or had associations with schools other than as parents and students. In the major universities, research productivity is the motivating force.

Ironically, schools of education in these research-oriented universities have found it increasingly difficult to staff teacher education programs and frequently do so with persons not members of the regular faculty. The decline of interest among some of the most prestigious schools of education was a motivating factor in bringing together the initial Holmes Group of deans for purposes of defining an appropriate role in the field (Holmes Group, 1986). There is some irony in that their effort has attracted considerable national attention but little surprise over the fact that the deans perceived their concerted action to be necessary.

I have argued for a symbiotic relationship between schools and universities for purposes of simultaneously improving schools and the education of educators. But, given the present gulf between the two, is there any hope of establishing school-university partnerships, let alone of making them productive? Phillip Schlechty, who has probed deeply into both the circumstances of teaching and the conditions of teacher education, has

expressed pessimism about either institutions of higher education or schooling effecting change in teacher education and skepticism about the potential effectiveness of a union of the two:

> The final reason I find collaboration a dubious solution to the problems of teacher education is that it too often is based on the assumption that enlightened self-interest is an appropriate foundation upon which to build professional education programs. This assumption is mistaken. (Schlechty, 1985, p. 29)

His solution is the creation of a new type of teacher education organization--a site-based professional school--that is ". . . outside the public schools, outside the university, and outside the teachers' organizations" (page 45). Currently, with a foot in the University of Louisville and a foot in the nearby Jefferson County Schools, he appears to be well-stationed for the creation of such a setting.

Personally, I am convinced that we do not now have the proper model of a professional school for the preparation of educators. And, since we do not, the improvement of schooling is seriously hampered. Perhaps we need a new kind of cultural entity in which the major interested parties participate along the lines of the one envisioned by Schlechty. What I am convinced of--and perhaps Schlechty would agree--is that we are not yet ready to bring one into full-blown reality. My fear, my near-nightmare, is that one will be legislated into existence and promptly replicated in several states. Such a step would set back progress toward a solution for years, perhaps irrevocably.

What I propose instead is setting in motion a process through which we might arrive at one or more viable solutions to the interwoven problems of

getting both better schools and better preparation programs for those who will staff them. At present, given the proposition that we may need new kinds of institutions, the institutions with self-interests most at stake are the schools and the universities. But, as Schlechty points out, enlightened self-interest will not suffice. In my judgment, pursuit of self-interests will be productive only to the degree that the self-interests of schools and universities are seen by both to overlap and be sufficiently compelling to warrant the maintenance of a symbiotic relationship. The result of such a partnership could be the redesign of existing institutions or the creation of new ones.

The National Network for Educational Renewal

The collaborative relationship between schools and universities envisioned here must be regarded as a kind of social experiment. No compelling models exist; those who are now in search of such are advised to exercise great caution. As my colleague, Ann Lieberman, facetiously remarked recently: "If you're out in front by three months, you're an expert."

While collating data from A Study of Schooling in the late 1970s and early 1980s, colleagues and I broached the idea of a school-university partnership with the chief administrators of several school districts and community colleges in Southern California. The Laboratory in School and Community Education, University of California, Los Angeles, served as a

kind of hub for the collaboratives that emerged from this initial meeting. The UCLA connection was severed with the disappearance of this Laboratory and its personnel in 1985. But a group of second-level administrators (and some teachers) and several superintendents for whom the partnership had been most meaningful were not to be deterred. They sought out and secured the cooperation of the Claremont Graduate School, and this partnership is beginning to flourish once more at the time of writing. The partnership has been renamed the Southern California Council for Educational Renewal.

By 1983, the dean and some faculty members of the College of Education, Brigham Young University, had become interested in the possibilities for their geographic area of what was developing in Southern California. Over a two-year period, I met with this faculty and superintendents from the five nearby school districts (enrolling about one third of the public school students in Utah). The guiding principles from the California effort were examined, re-interpreted, and re-defined. The principle of equality among institutions was strongly endorsed and was reflected in the creation of a Governing Board of six equal members--the five superintendents and the dean of the college of education. Agreements as to structure, agenda, membership of task forces, and the like were nailed down in April 1984. The BYU School District Partnership is now an integral part of and, indeed, a major catalyst in the simultaneous improvement of schooling and the education of educators in the Wasatch Valley.

In 1984, several associate superintendents from districts in the greater Seattle area arranged a meeting with a professor of education at

the University of Washington whose interests in the schools were well known. Several had completed their doctorates under his direction. They wanted to be proactive, not merely reactive, to mandates in effecting educational improvement and sought the collaboration of the University of Washington. They got it--from this professor to the dean of the College of Education, the provost, and the president. And they got similar support from their superintendents and districts.

The initial activity--a summer seminar for seven selected leaders from each of ten districts--began a process, which still continues, of inquiring into the major problems of schooling through reading relevant reports and books and interacting with their authors nationwide. Then, in the summer of 1985, representatives of the University of Washington and the school districts (embracing about 30% of the State's school population) established the Puget Sound Educational Consortium, with a five-year agreement to collaborate along several fronts. School districts contributed to a substantial operating budget, the university allocated the time of personnel, and a full-time executive director assumed office in August 1986. The agenda includes an array of topics, issues, and problems in which the school districts and the university clearly have overlapping self-interests.

During this period of approximately five years, from formation of the partnership in Southern California to creation of the Puget Sound Educational Consortium, I was in communication with persons representing other settings interested in established school-university partnerships. These

settings varied in their ongoing collaborations from very little to formal agreements, especially in the area of staff development. In some instances, representatives from both school districts and colleges or universities had not yet even met to talk about the creation of a partnership. In others, very little more effort was needed to meet the criteria discussed in conversations with me. The National Network (of School-University Partnerships) for Educational Renewal was created in April 1986. Today, the NNER is made up of 14 partnerships in as many states. Representatives of at least two dozen additional settings have expressed serious interest in becoming either regular or affiliated members.

The Mission of the NNER

My letters of invitation to selected partnerships to join the National Network for Educational Renewal set certain conditions for membership. In effect, each partnership entered into an arrangement constituting an agreement with fundamental operating assumptions and a commitment to work toward the solution of bedrock educational issues, all of which were spelled out in what is now referred to as the mission statement.

It should be clearly understood that the NNER is not an entity in itself, with an independent identity. It is a network and nothing more. The critical entities are the partnerships, themselves composites of several different institutions. There is difficulty, at this stage, in identifying what is being networked, since the partnerships are all in

early formative stages. Yet, people seem to understand the purpose, usefulness, and nature of networks. The primary purposes have to do with strengthening the resolve of those involved in the units or activities constituting a partnership and profiting from the experiences of those involved in similar enterprises. A network comes to stand for certain things that it and its members promote. The NNER, then, is a force for educational improvement powerful enough, because of its members' shared commitments, to exert influence at levels of both practice and policy. Each partnership becomes stronger, presumably, because of its affiliations with the others and the NNER becomes more influential and creditable as its members mature, become more confident, and accomplish good work. It is reasonable to envision a process of institutional and educational renewal sustaining itself whether or not there continue to be political initiatives for reform.

The mission statement of the NNER, abstracted below, sets forth broad goals, a structure, processes, and a substantive agenda for its member school-university partnerships.

Goals

There are three very general goals:

1. To promote exemplary performance by universities in their role of educating educators (increasing the usefulness of their research function is a major part of this role);

2. To promote exemplary performance by schools in their role of educating the nation's young people (developing appropriate district support is a major part of this role);

3. To promote constructive collaboration between schools (and their districts) and universities in assuring exemplary performance of both in areas of overlapping mutual self-interest.

Structure

Each partnership is to have a governing board representing the collaborating institutions as equal partners, a secretariat, an operating budget, a five-year time commitment, and endorsement from the highest level of authority in each institution. The working arrangements of each partnership are to be characterized by the following:

1. Task forces charged with developing plans and strategies for addressing the most critical and most calcified problems of improving schools and the education of educators, each staffed with appropriate representation of schools, district offices, universities, consultants, etc.;

2. An orderly process of authorizing and monitoring projects and activities undertaken in the partnership so as to assure widespread understanding with a minimum of bureaucratic procedures and controls;

3. An ongoing effort to document, analyze, and interpret successes and failures and communicate these findings within and between partnerships;

4. The establishment and maintenance of connecting linkages with the NNER for purpose of giving help to and receiving help from other network partnerships;

5. A deliberate effort to secure additional funds from external funding sources;

6. The redirection of existing funds within and across institutions for purposes of securing the time necessary for educational renewal;

7. Arrangements for sharing information, ideas, and even resources within and across network partnerships, including the sharing of responsibility for advocating the best in educational policy and practice.

Processes

Five interrelated process clusters spell out the operating principles of school-university partnerships:

1. Equal Partners:

Districts, schools, and universities will work closely together with one another as equal partners towards satisfying mutually beneficial self-interests. Successful partnerships have at least three essential characteristics: (a) a moderate degree of dissimilarity between or among partners; (b) the potential for the mutual satisfaction of self-interests; and (c) sufficient selflessness on the part of each

partner to assure the satisfaction of self-interests by all involved. Schools and universities can be seen to possess the first two characteristics. It is up to the members of the partnership to maximize the potential for maintaining the third ingredient of a successful, symbiotic relationship.

2. Communication:

Partnerships must develop the means for efficient and effective sharing of information and knowledge produced by its members and coming from other sources. Districts, schools, and universities in collaboration for the improvement of schooling and education must maintain a commitment to quality information and knowledge in context--that is, in terms of relevant historical, current, and projected social, political, and economic circumstances and conditions at local, state, national, and international levels.

3. Leadership:

Leaders at all levels of the educational enterprise must possess, endorse, and communicate a clear, coherent set of fundamental educational values to which all participants in the enterprise can be committed. This set must be small enough so as to maximize near consensus of endorsement and yet permit maximum flexibility for local initiative and creative response. Leaders, therefore, must be willing and able to empower others with the necessary resources (e.g., time) and autonomy for inquiry and school renewal.

4. Renewal:

Understanding that direction and support from all educational levels is necessary, the school is ultimately where students are taught and is, therefore, the center of educational change. But educational change does not appear to come about and be sustained through intervention and installation techniques. Rather, it appears to require the ongoing involvement of the significant persons most affected by change (e.g., teachers, administrators, parents, students) in the development of innovative activities. Resources and time, therefore, must be provided at the building level for meaningful dialogue, decision making, action taking, and evaluation--in short, for the ongoing process of inquiry and school renewal.

5. Accountability:

Accountability is best understood and acted upon as a system of shared responsibilities wisely distributed over the "organizational pyramid" of educational leadership. Clearly, the largest power base is at the bottom of this pyramid, at the building level, including principals, teachers, students, and parents. Given the school as the center of change, wisely distributed responsibility consists, in significant part, of providing the leadership and resources necessary for staff inquiry and renewal activities in schools.

Substance

The recent major studies of schooling (for example, Boyer, 1983; Goodlad, 1984; Sizer, 1984) have once again identified the same crucial set of problems that seem to reoccur over the history of the American educational experiment--the attempt to provide a common education for all the nation's youth. It is a fundamental belief of the NNER that these problems --for example, educating educators, relevant curricula, equal access to knowledge, staff development, student alienation, functions of schooling, research into practice--although appearing recalcitrant, can be significantly improved through genuine collaborative effort among concerned educators.

Partnerships joining the NNER are committed to this substantive agenda. This does not mean that each will address action to all areas. Nor does it mean that those selecting from the agenda will choose to proceed in similar fashion on identical sub-topics. Rather, the entire agenda will be advanced by several partnerships addressing each major theme, each in its own way but in communication with all other partnerships and in reference to the agenda as a whole.

1. The creation of exemplary sites in which future teachers are educated which demonstrate the best we know about how schools should function.

2. The creation of internships and residencies for educational specialists (including administrators) through which these professionals

may observe and gain experience with the best possible educational practices.

3. The development of curricula that truly reflect the best analyses and projections of what young people need.

4. The assurance of equal access of students to these curricula.

5. The cultivation of site-based staff development activities designed to foster continual school renewal, particularly of the curriculum and accompanying pedagogical practices.

6. The restructuring of schools to assure increased continuity in students' programs, decreased accumulation of partial and inadequate or misdirected learnings, decreased alienation of students, and more effective utilization of varied teaching resources, including technology.

7. The continual infusion of knowledge relative to provision of good education in schools and in programs preparing educators.

8. The creation and utilization of opportunities to promote in the community a continuing informed dialogue about what education is and why it has more to do with the general welfare of both individual and society than just preparation for jobs.

Describing and Appraising Partnership Efforts

The partnerships were not required, at the time of joining the NNER, to meet all of these conditions but to work toward them. Item 3 under Structure has proven to be the one most glossed over and, indeed, ignored. Several partnerships have taken this requirement very seriously, assigning personnel to it. In two or three instances, university professors have taken on this charge as part of their research activity, with research assistants assigned by their universities. It is fair to say, however, that most of the partnerships are still circling the requirement and have not yet come to grips with it.

The Center for Educational Renewal brought together in the summer of 1986 a small working party to conceptualize the task so as to give some direction and assistance to the partnerships. At the time of this writing, the Center has received word of a small grant from the Hewlett Foundation which will support the meetings during 1987 of an NNER task force to continue this work.

Pervading the above mission statement of the NNER is the concept of an inquiring process, fed by data, central to individual and institutional renewal. But one soon becomes painfully aware of the fact that gathering information, reflecting on this information in concert with others, making decisions, implementing these decisions, and then critiquing this entire process simply is not characteristic of the educational enterprise. Even in universities, where research and inquiry on the part of individual

scholars is highly endorsed, there is very little evidence of this critical inquiry being part of the process of curricular or programmatic change. And it is at least as rare in schools and school districts. Perhaps this is part of the explanation as to why both schooling and teacher education are so vulnerable to external intervention in the form of state and other regulatory requirements.

Coda

The foregoing narrative has differentiated quite markedly between partnerships and networks and the purposes for which they might be used appropriately. School-university partnerships, given adequate commitment by all partners to satisfy the other partners' self-interests, offer unique potential for changing the ways schools and universities conduct their educational business. Networks have little potential for effecting fundamental change but much potential for sharing the state of the art and bolstering all members in the work conducted in their own settings. This difference between partnerships and networks is sustained by Clark in his review of the literature on both (Occasional Paper No. 2 in this series). Notwithstanding the rather obvious substantive connection between the conduct of schools and the education of educators for these schools, one dare not assume that bringing together the two sets of institutions for purposes of improving both is a marriage made in heaven. Indeed, the gulf and, sometimes, distrust between the two suggests the need for a shotgun wedding, if one is to occur at all. And, it must be said, some of the

dialogues among school and university personnel in which I engaged while negotiating the creation of school-university partnerships at times suggested a shotgun just barely hidden in a closet. This may be an idea whose time is come even if many of the potential partners appear somewhat leary of the marriage. After all, shotgun weddings do not necessarily auger unsuccessful marriages. Sometimes they merely hasten or legitimize the inevitable.

There is today widespread interest in the linking of schools and universities on the part of policy makers, foundation officials, and educators. News of the National Network for Educational Renewal and its member partnerships has brought many letters and telephone calls to my office. Several of the partnerships already are receiving requests for information and to visit. The membership of the NNER could be doubled immediately through admitting settings willing to meet the criteria and pay a fee for the privilege. (No membership fee currently is charged.)

This interest is at once both gratifying and frightening--gratifying because the proposed union of schools and universities for the fulfillment of common purposes makes a good deal of sense; frightening because it is so easy to put forward all the formal trappings of collaboration without creating the symbiosis necessary to fundamental change. One of the most deceptive of these trappings is an alternative cooperative program, usually supported temporarily from outside resources, small in size, well advertised, but conducted apart from the standard programs, with no genuine intentions of incorporating the new into the old. This is what I refer to from time to time as innovating without changing anything.

The concept and vitality of partnerships between schools and universities are much larger and of much greater importance than is one organizational effort such as the National Network (of School-University Partnerships) for Educational Renewal. I have recounted my own personal experiences with educational improvement efforts, including the NNER, because they are close at hand and may portend the kinds of structural, attitudinal, and behavioral changes we must risk if we are to make more than marginal impacts on schools and universities.

My colleagues and I are engaged, then, in an ongoing social experiment accompanied by powerful learning experiences. I encourage others to experiment in similar but inevitably different ways. Perhaps, as a result, we will discover how best to assure the continuous renewal of our educational institutions and those who work in and for them.

(202)H

REFERENCES

Bahner, J. M. "An Elementary School Faculty at Work." Doctoral dissertation, University of Chicago, 1960.

Bentzen, M. M. et al. Changing Schools: The Magic Feather Principle. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1974.

Boyer, E. L. High School. New York: Harper & Row, 1983.

Buchmann, M. "Reporting and Using Educational Research: Conviction or Persuasion?" In The Ecology of School Renewal, Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part I, edited by John I. Goodlad, pp. 170-191. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1987.

Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy. A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century. New York: Carnegie Forum, 1986.

Clark, R. W. "School-University Relationships: Partnerships and Networks." Occasional Paper No. 2, Center for Educational Renewal, College of Education, University of Washington, Seattle, 1986.

Goodlad, J. I. The Dynamics of Educational Change. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1975.

Goodlad, J. I. "An Ecological Approach to Change in Elementary-School Settings." Elementary School Journal 78 (1977): 95-105.

Goodlad, J. I. "The Great American Schooling Experiment." Phi Delta Kappan 67 (1985): 266-271

Goodlad, J. I. "The Individual School and Its Principal: Key Setting and Key Person in Educational Leadership." Educational Leadership 13 (1955): 2-6.

Goodlad, J. I. "In Pursuit of Visions." Elementary School Journal 59 (1958): 1-17.

Goodlad, J. I. A Place Called School. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1984.

Goodlad, J. I., and R. H. Anderson. The Nongraded Elementary School. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1959 (rev. 1963, reprinted Teachers College Press, 1987).

Goodlad, J. I., and F. Jordan. "When School and College Collaborate." Educational Leadership 7 (April 1950): 461-465.

Holmes Group. Tomorrow's Teachers, College of Education, Michigan State University, East Lansing, 1986.

Judge, H. American Graduate Schools of Education. New York: Ford Foundation, 1982.

Lortie, D. C. Schoolteacher. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1975.

Peters, T. J., and R. H. Waterman. In Search of Excellence: Lessons from America's Best-Run Companies. New York: Warner Books, 1982.

Schlechty, P. C. "Reconstructing the Teaching Occupation: A Proposal." Unpublished manuscript, 1985.

Sizer, T. R. Horace's Compromise: The Dilemma of the American High School. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, 1984.

Tye, K. A. "Changing Our Schools: The Realities." A Study of Schooling. Technical Report No. 30, Laboratory in School and Community Education, Graduate School of Education, University of California, Los Angeles, 1981.

APPENDIX

Listed below in alphabetical order are the 14 school-university partnerships constituting the National Network for Educational Renewal and the names of the executive directors and the address of each.

NATIONAL NETWORK FOR EDUCATIONAL RENEWAL

EXECUTIVE DIRECTORS

Arizona

Paul Heckman, Executive Director
Greater Tucson School-University Partnership
College of Education
University of Arizona
Tucson, AZ 85721
(602)621-1462

Arkansas

Sara Murphy, Executive Director
Arkansas Education Renewal Consortium
6 Butterfield Lane
Little Rock, AR 72212
(501)224-4088

California

Joe Weeres, Acting Executive Director
Southern California Council for Educational Renewal
Claremont Graduate School
Claremont, CA 91711-6160
(714)621-8076

Colorado

Lance V. Wright, Executive Director
Colorado Partnership for Educational Renewal
School of Education
University of Colorado
Denver, CO 80202
(303)556-3366

Hawaii

Juvenna Chang, Executive Director
Hawaii School University Partnership
The Kamehameha Schools/Bernice Pauahi Bishop Estate
Honolulu, HI 96817
(808)842-8349

Indiana

Edward L. Robbins, Executive Director
Indiana Public School-University Partnership
Indiana University
School of Education
902 W. New York
Indianapolis, IN 46223
(317)274-6801

Maine

Lynne Miller, Executive Director
Southern Maine Partnership
University of Southern Maine
College of Education
Gorham, ME 04038
(207)780-5443

Massachusetts

Robert Sinclair, Executive Director
The Coalition for School Improvement
University of Massachusetts
School of Education
Amherst, MA 01003
(413)545-3642

Michigan

Charles Thompson, Executive Director
The Professional Schools Group
Michigan State University
College of Education
East Lansing, MI 48824
(517)355-6681

New York

Tom Mulkeen, Coordinator
New York Network for Educational Renewal
Forham University
Graduate School of Education
113 W. 60th Street
New York, NY 10023
(212)841-5292

Utah

Joseph Bishop, Executive Director
BYU-Public School Partnership
Brigham Young University
217 McKay Building
Provo, UT 84602
(801)378-7680

Virginia

Phyllis Hotchkiss, Executive Director
Virginia School-University Partnership
University of Virginia
Curry Memorial School of Education
Charlottesville, VA 22903
(804)924-0863

Washington

Ann Lieberman, Executive Director
Puget Sound Educational Consortium
University of Washington
College of Education, DQ-12
Seattle, WA 98195
(206)543-7267

Wyoming

Gerald Carroll, Executive Dirctor
Wyoming School-University Partnership
Johnson County School District #1
Route 1, 601 West Lott Street
Buffalo, WY 82834
(307)684-9571

REGIONAL COORDINATORS

Richard W. Clark
Deputy Superintendent
Bellevue Public Schools
P.O. Box 90010
Bellevue, WA 98009-9010
(206)455-6044

Paul Heckman
Associate Dean
College of Education
University of Arizona
Tucson, AZ 85721
(602)621-1462

Carol Wilson
Assistant Superintendent
Adams County School District #12
11285 Highline Drive
Northglenn, CO 80233
(303)451-1561